UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,861	02/16/2001	Gregory M. Burgess	50037.24US01	5183

27488 7590 05/10/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
CHANKONG, DOHM	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/785,861	BURGESS, GREGORY M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dohm Chankong	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 March 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1> This action is in response to Applicant's request for continued examination. Claims 1-30 are presented for further examination.

Claim Objections

2> Claims 9, 16 and 30 need to be amended so they are complete sentences.

Response to Arguments

3> Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4> The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5> Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Claim 1 is rejected because of lack of proper antecedent basis: it is unclear to which "first format" is being referred by "the first format" (there are two "a first formats" referenced in the claim);

b. Claims 10 and 22 are rejected for having vague language the renders the claim indefinite. Specifically, they cite a "request being a translation of the property into a first format". It is unclear how a request is a translation; the claims should be amended to more clearly define the limitations of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6> The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7> Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudhan et al, U.S Patent No. 6.563.919 ["Aravamudhan"], in view of Mendez et al, U.S Patent No. 6.023.708 ["Mendez"].

8> As to claim 1, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for receiving and distributing a message within a mobile device (abstract), comprising:

a storage component in communication with at least one messaging component and a data store, wherein the messaging component translates a message to a first format by passing properties of a message to the storage component in a first format (Figure 5, column

4, lines 45-60, column 6, line 11 to column 7, line 45, column 8, lines 60-65 and claims 1 and 2 where: the UDS is analogous to the storage component, the UMM analogous to the messaging component and the cluster of gateways is analogous to the data store and Aravamudhan's normalized protocol is analogous to the first protocol).

Aravamudhan discloses translating messages of different types into a message of a unified protocol (first format), but does not explicitly disclose translating the properties from the first format to a second format.

9> Mendez discloses a system similar to Aravamudhan; both create a universal (global) messaging format that can be utilized by multiple devices with disparate protocols. Mendez further discloses a storage component configured to translate the properties from a first format to a second format and to pass the translated properties to the data store, wherein the second format is consistent with an underlying storage mechanism of the mobile devices [Figure 1 | column 3 «lines 57-65» | column 4 «lines 11-22» | claims 1, 14 and 15 where : Mendez's "global format" is interpreted as the first format; this format is further converted into a second format (format B), that is stored in the data store of the remote device. Therefore, the message is consistent with the storage mechanism of the remote device]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Mendez's two-step message format translation into Aravamudhan's unified mobility manager to enable the synchronization of multiple messages. The combination of Mendez and Aravamudhan provides the creation of a global or unified messaging protocol (analogous to client's first

format) for general use by the network devices of the system that Mendez further translates into a second format that is consistent with a remote device.

10> As to claim 2, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium, wherein the messaging component comprises a mail application (column 3, line 18-24 and column 7, lines 14-45).

11> As to claim 3, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium with a messaging component but does not teach the messaging component comprising a message form.

12> Mendez teaches a computer-implemented medium, wherein the messaging component comprises a message form (column 5 «lines 29-35» : email, file, calender, etc). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aravamudhan's messaging component to include message forms taught by Mendez to more enable compliance with a wider variety of messaging formats.

13> As to claim 4, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium, wherein the messaging component comprises a message transport (column 10, lines 6-10 and claim 1).

14> As to claim 5, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium further comprising another messaging component that communicates with the at least one

messaging component and the storage component using the first format (column 7, lines 7-45 and column 8, line 66 to column 10, line 16).

15> As to claim 6, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium wherein the storage component further comprises at least one handler that is configured to perform the translation of the properties from the first format to the second format (column 6, lines 61-62 and column 7, lines 27-45).

16> As to claim 7, Aravamudhan teaches a computer-implemented medium wherein the handler is registered to translate a particular type of property, and wherein the storage component is makes use of the handler if a property of the message corresponds to the particular type of property (column 9, lines 23-40 - wherein the property that triggers the translation of the message is the format of said message).

17> Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudhan and Mendez as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, in view of Buckley et al (hereinafter Buckley) U.S Patent No. 6,035,327.

18> Buckley was cited by applicant in IDS #5, from March 1, 2004.

19> As to claim 8 and 9, Aravamudhan does not specifically teach a computer implemented medium wherein the handler is further configured to create a new property from a property passed to the storage component.

20> Buckley teaches a computer-implemented medium wherein the handler is further configured to create a new property from a property passed to the storage component (column 10, lines 47-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the property creation functionality into Aravamudhan's handler to handle any properties of the messages being sent to the data store.

21> Claims 10-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudhan, in view of Mendez, in further view of Guck, U.S Patent No. 5.848.415.

22> As to claim 10, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-implemented medium having computer executable-instructions for performing steps, comprising:

receiving a request, the request being a translation of the property into a first format, the data store being configured to store data in a second format, the request including data associated with the property (Figure 5 | column 4, lines 60-67 where: the UDS is analogous to the data store , the normalized data stored in the UDS analogous to the first format).

Aravamudhan does not explicitly disclose translating the data associated with the property from the first format into the second format; and

storing the data in the data store in the second format.

Also Aravamudhan does disclose storing message data [column 14 «lines 27-34»] but does not explicitly disclose a request to store a property of a message within a data store.

23› Mendez discloses translating the data associated with the property from the first format into the second format [Figure 1 | column 3 «lines 57-65» | column 4 «lines 11-22» | claims 1, 14 and 15 where : Mendez's format B is analogous to a second format and the data store is located in the remote device]; and

storing the data in the data store in the second format [Figure 1 | column 3 «lines 57-65» | column 4 «lines 11-22» | claims 1, 14 and 15].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Mendez's two-step message format translation into Aravamudhan's unified mobility manager to enable the synchronization of multiple messages. The combination of Mendez and Aravamudhan provides the creation of a global or unified messaging protocol (analogous to client's first format) for general use by the network devices of the system that Mendez further translates into a second format that is consistent with a remote device. Therefore, it is apparent that Mendez extends Aravamudhan's unified messaging protocol so it can be adapted and sent other devices.

24› Guck discloses receiving a request to store a property of a message within a data store [column 4 «lines 3-33» | column 8 «lines 43-48» where: Guck's submission of a source document is analogous to the request]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Aravamudhan's request as Guck's storage request for storing a message property into the database. As Aravamudhan suggests storing message data (properties) in a database, one would have been motivated to perform such an implementation to allow users in Aravamudhan's system the means to control which messages are stored in the database

25> As to claim 11, Aravamudhan discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 10, wherein the property includes a descriptor that distinguishes the property from other properties (Figure 4, item 50 and column 8, lines 10-23 where: the names of the normalized data (such as AAV, AuthCap) for each network personality is analogous to the descriptor).

26> As to claim 12, Aravamudhan discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 11, wherein the descriptor comprises a property type (column 8, lines 10-54).

27> As to claim 13, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium wherein translating the data comprises passing the data to a handler for processing, the handler being associated with the descriptor (column 4, line 45 to column 5, line 7, column 6, lines 61-62 and column 7, lines 40-42).

28> As to claim 14, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium wherein the handler is registered to process data of a type associated with the descriptor (column 6, lines 61-62 and column 7, line 66 to column 8, line 44).

29> As to claim 15, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium wherein the handler is further configured to convert the property from the first format into the second format (Figure 5 and column 4, lines 51-67).

30> As to claim 16, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium, wherein the handler if further configured to translate the property into at least one other property, the at least one other property conforming to the second format (Figure 5, column 4, lines 51-67 and column 7, lines 7-45).

31> As to claim 17, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium wherein storing the data in the data store comprises storing the data in a plurality of tables (Figure 4 and column 8, lines 55-65).

32> As to claim 19, Aravamudhan discloses a computer-readable medium wherein one of the plurality of tables is configured to contain certain properties, and another one of the plurality of tables is configured to contain certain other properties (Figure 4, column 4, lines 3-10 and 55-65 where: one of the tables is configured to contain categories and properties of network personality, while another table is configured for a different network personality).

33> Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudhan and Mendez, in further view of Miller et al, U.S Patent No. 6.615.241 ["Miller"].

34> Aravamudhan and Miller do not teach a computer-readable medium wherein each of the plurality of tables corresponds to a message folder.

35> Miller teaches a computer-readable medium wherein each of the plurality of tables corresponds to a message folder [column 11 «lines 32-37» | column 9 «lines 40-50» | column 15 «lines 17-62»]. Miller discloses an advantage of utilizing the table structure to store messages properties so the system can handle decisions more quickly instead of having to re-scan the entire message for the requested property. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Miller's plurality of tables into Aravamudhan's unified messaging system.

36> Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being patentable over Aravamudhan, Mendez and Guck, in view of Peters et al (hereinafter Peters), U.S Patent No. 6,292,795.

37> As to claim 20, Aravamudhan does not teach a computer-readable medium wherein a table within the plurality of tables is configured as an overflow mechanism for another of the tables within the plurality of tables.

38> Peters teaches a computer-readable medium wherein a table within the plurality of tables is configured as an overflow mechanism for another of the tables within the plurality of tables (column 4, line 51 to column 5, lines 40-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement an overflow table in Aravamudhan to manage any extra data from messages whenever the other tables are filled to their maximum data capacity.

39> As to claim 21, Aravamudhan does not teach a computer-readable medium wherein the overflow mechanism comprises a file system.

40> Peters teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the overflow mechanism comprises a file system (column 5, lines 3-10 where the directory is the file system). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aravamudhan's overflow mechanism to utilize a file system to make it easier to organize, store and sort the information contained in the overflow mechanism.

41> Claims 22, 23 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being anticipated by Guck, in view of Mendez.

42> As to claim 22 Guck teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps, comprising:

receiving a request to retrieve a property of a message from a data store, the request being in a first format, the data store being configured to store data in a second format (column 4, lines 52-55, column 6, lines 25-33, column 7, lines 27-33 and 49-56, column 9, lines 10-24 and column 11, lines 48-55);

retrieving the data from the data store in a second format (column 5, lines 1-9); and

translating the data associated with the property from the second format into the first format (column 4, lines 55-65).

Guck does disclose that the second format is consistent with an underlying storage format of a device [column 4 «lines 3-23 and 35-47» | claim 1] but does not specifically disclose that the device is a mobile device.

Guck also does not disclose the request translates the property into a first format.

43› Mendez discloses storing data in a format that is consistent with an underlying storage format of a mobile device [Figure 1 «item 102»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Mendez's mobile device functionality into Guck's data conversion system in addition to Guck's other devices. One would have been motivated to perform such an implementation for the obtained advantage of implementing mobile devices into Guck, increasing Guck's data translation capabilities.

Mendez also discloses first translating the property into a first format (global format) before translating the property further into a second format associated with a mobile device [Figure 1 | column 3 «lines 42-56» | column 4 «lines 11-22»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Mendez's two-step message format translation into Guck's translation system to enable the synchronization of multiple messages. The combination of Mendez and Guck provides the creation of a global messaging protocol (analogous to client's first format) for general use by the network devices of the system that Mendez further translates into a second format that is consistent with a remote device. Therefore, it is apparent that Mendez would enable easier conversion of the multiple types of data by storing the types as a global format.

44> As to claim 23, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium further comprising passing the translated data to a component associated with the request (column 11, lines 24-33).

45> As to claim 25, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the property includes a descriptor that distinguishes the property from other properties (column 12, lines 14-15 where the parameter of the file is the descriptor [image/tiff, image/jpeg]).

46> As to claim 26, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the descriptor comprises a property type (column 12, lines 14-15).

47> As to claim 27, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein translating the data comprises passing the data to a handler for processing, the handler being associated with the descriptor (column 4, lines 48-62).

48> As to claim 28, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the handler is registered to process data of a type associated with the descriptor (Figure 5 and column 12, lines 43-54).

49> As to claim 29, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the handler is further configured to convert the property from the first format into the second format (Figure 5 and column 12, lines 43-54).

50> As to claim 30, Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the handler if further configured to translate the property into at least one other property, the at least one other property conforming to the second format (Figures 6, 7 and column 12, lines 10-27).

51> Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guck and Mendez, as applied to claim 22 above, in further view of Miller.

52> Guck teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the data is retrieved from a table (column 4, lines 3-23).

53> Guck does not teach retrieving from at least one table in a plurality of tables. Miller discloses a database that can store information in a plurality of tables [column 12 «lines 40-50»]. It would have been obvious one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of tables in Guck's database to increase the storage efficiency and capacity for storing data as well as providing a more efficient storage means for the properties of the messages as taught by Miller.

Response to Amendment

54> It is Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art. Examiner has broadly interpreted the claims in

scope parellel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly define the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner